

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION

February 21, 2007

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Fredrick Lighty
Ernest Gingrich
Dennis Guise
Roy Newsome
Richard Beverly
Betsy Sibert
William Neff

ALSO PRESENT

Mike Hess, HRG
Chip Millard, Dauphin County
Dianne Moran, Planning & Zoning Officer

Call to Order

Mr. Lighty called the regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission to order at 7:02 pm, on February 21, 2007 in Room 171 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. (This meeting was rescheduled from February 14, 2007 due to inclement weather.)

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Mr. Lighty led the recitation of the Pledge.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Newsome made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 13, 2006, December 20, 2006, and January 10, 2007 meetings. Ms. Sibert seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-21
Shuler All Pro Car Wash, Linglestown Road

Mr. Beverly made a motion to table the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-21 for Shuler All Pro Car Wash, Linglestown Road. Mr. Neff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-37
St. Thomas Roasters

Mr. Beverly made a motion to table the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-37 for St. Thomas Roasters. Mr. Neff seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan #06-42
Stray Winds Farm

Mr. Beverly made a motion to table Preliminary Subdivision and Land Development Plan #06-42. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neff, and passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-46
Lawrence W. Conjar

Mr. Beverly made a motion to table Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #06-46. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neff, and passed unanimously.

Preliminary Subdivision Plan #06-47
Charlston Riding

Mr. Beverly made a motion to table Preliminary Subdivision Plan #06-47. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neff, and passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-40
Dauphin County Technical School
Additions and Renovations

Ms. Moran stated this plan was tabled at the January 10, 2007 Planning Commission meeting in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to address comments and provide additional traffic information. This information has been provided to the Commission.

Ms. Moran stated that this plan proposes additions and alterations to the existing Dauphin County Technical School (DCTS) located at 6001 Locust Lane and west of Fairmont Drive. This property consists of 47.0418 acres and is located south of Locust Lane and west of Fairmont Drive. This property is zoned IN, Institutional District, and is served by public water and public sewer. Five building additions and two parking areas are proposed.

The applicant has requested the following waivers:

1. Preliminary plan submission.
2. Plan sheet size.

There are updated comments from HRG dated February 9, 2007.

Mr. Neff asked if the comments offered at the last Planning Commission meeting have been incorporated into this revised plan.

Mr. Lighty stated that at the last meeting it was asked if a traffic study was warranted, and he asked if that was investigated for this meeting. Ms. Moran stated that the first page of the Traffic Design and Planning memo explains that enrollment at the school is 952 students, and will increase to 977 with the expansion and renovations. There will be an increase of 25 students. The existing daycare facility will be discontinued.

Ms. Moran stated that the Lower Paxton Township ordinances state that a traffic impact study is required if the project will generate more than 100 peak hour trips. According to the data, the highest number of trips is 11 trips. The school has decided not to pursue all of the projects it originally wanted to provide.

Mr. Brian Bingeman, Kurowski & Wilson Engineers, 470 Friendship Road, Harrisburg, was present on behalf of the plan.

Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant has received the comments from Dauphin County, HRG, and Township Staff. Mr. Bingeman stated he did receive the comments, noting that the comments from the County are not new. Mr. Lighty asked if the applicant will have a problem with any of the comments. Mr. Bingeman answered no.

Mr. Lighty questioned the traffic generation assessment, specifically when and how the numbers were generated. Mr. Bingeman stated that originally there were supposed to be six programs developed with this project. Four of those were eliminated; one was redistricted within the building. There will now only be one additional program. There is a letter from Tom Crabtree explaining how the student population projections were put together. Based on the sponsoring school districts, there is a typical percentage that attend the technical school. The Pennsylvania Department of Education projections show a total for the 2007-2008 year 7,932 total students in the sponsoring school districts. The percentage going to DCTS would be 952 students, which is very similar to the current DCTS population. There is no net student increase according to the PDE.

Mr. Lighty noted that when the school district was in to get a new school they said there would be a dramatic increase of schools.

Jeff Straub, the architect from Crabtree Rohrbaugh, stated originally there were to be 6 additional programs adding about 200 students. The County decided to scale the project back. Financing was also a large factor. The PDE projections also affected the decision, showing no increase in population in the County, and a possible decrease at the technical school. The count for this coming year is 10 students less than the current year.

Mr. Straub stated that they are adding substantial square footage to the building, and that is to add square footage to the existing programs, which are undersized. They are adding a large

construction yard, about 10,000-12,000 square feet, for use by the masonry, HVAC, and electrical programs. The diesel lab will get a correctly sized department, so they can have three bays to work in.

Mr. Guise asked if these improvements would attract more enrollment into those programs. Mr. Bingeman answered no, adding that PDE projects a decrease in student body over the next 10-15 years, and the sending schools are giving that same evidence from the sending schools as well.

Mr. Guise asked if the new square footage could be adapted to add more programs in the future. Mr. Bingeman stated you could, but it would be very difficult to do in a technical school. The construction yard is only a 25 foot high space, that the shops would egress into, so it is landlocked, there is no access to it except through the other shops. There is an area for tractor trailer lifts, which would not easily transfer to anything else. They are adding a greenhouse that is falling apart, and in need of addition.

Mr. Newsome agreed with Mr. Guise, that the school board has chosen to enhance the facility, in order to enhance the instruction, which should enhance the enrollment. Mr. Newsome stated that the total enrollment has not gone down yet, even though they have projected a decrease. Mr. Newsome asked the cost of the project. Mr. Bingeman stated it is approximately mid \$20 million. Mr. Newsome stated there is \$20 million being spent on 25 students. Mr. Newsome was not sure why the school board is spending \$20 million to enhance a facility where the enrollment is going down. Mr. Newsome stated the Commission is concerned about the enrollment figure, the projections being used, and Mr. Newsome disagrees with them. Mr. Bingeman stated those numbers came from the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Mr. Lighty stated that a short time ago others were before the Planning Commission building a brand new high school, renovating another high school, and doing massive construction. They cited statistics about the skyrocketing student population, and now to suit the school district's needs, the population is decreasing. Mr. Lighty explained that he is not attacking the applicant personally, but he was frustrated to now be hearing the exact opposite of testimony given a short time ago. Mr. Lighty stated the school district is either increasing or it is not, and it should not matter what plan is before the Township at that time.

Mr. Bingeman explained that there is a state-wide trend, with a decrease in technical education, but an increase in student body within the school districts. Mr. Lighty stated that Mr. Bingeman already said that the technical school populations are calculated based on the overall student population, so if the overall population is going up, the technical student population should too. Mr. Bingeman stated he is not basing his information on the populations of the sending schools, but rather based on the projections of the students they will send to the technical schools. They will not increase their numbers.

Ms. Sibert stated that the students that want to go to technical school, and apply to go to technical school, may be going down even though the populations in Central Dauphin and Susquehanna Township schools may be increasing. Technical school is a choice the student has to make.

Mr. Bingeman stated that technical education has been put on the back burner for a long time, and that is what has happened at DCTS. Because of that, there are programs that are grossly undersized, meaning that the square footage for a particular program needs to be increased by two or three fold, to be adequate for current standards. This is what is happening at DCTS. This school never had a diesel program, but one was created over time, and it was squeezed into another space, now these renovations will provide a diesel department for that existing program.

Mr. Newsome noted he cannot argue program issues, but knows from a planning prospective, there are problems already occurring in that area. Every educational facility he is familiar with is increasing. It seems to be easy to come to the Township using figures that vary. The issue Mr. Newsome is concerned about is if the Commission will do an adequate job of looking at what is happening with transportation and with traffic flows around this facility, now and into the future.

Mr. Newsome stated he had a difficult time accepting that any school's population will go down. He has seen many projections be proven wrong. Technical schools are an integral part of the educational system, and there is a pretty good facility at DCTS, which is now being enhanced. Mr. Newsome did not understand how that would not draw more students. Mr. Bingeman's explanation did not explain it to Mr. Newsome.

Ms. Sibert stated that she is an educator, and educators are not encouraging students to go to technical school. Mr. Newsome stated if that is the case, \$20 million should not be spent on a technical school.

Mr. Newsome stated there is already a traffic problem at that facility.

Mr. Bingeman noted that originally the applicant was pursuing a 200 student increase, but in light of the population studies, it was decided to scale the project back because programs would be created that would not be filled. Warehousing and logistics is the only program being added.

Mr. Bingeman stated that there will be a maximum of 25 students in that new program and if every one of them drives to school, they will add 25 vehicles per day. Mr. Bingeman noted that the school is removing the early childhood department, which is not only the students in that program, there was a large amount of traffic coming to that program. The daycare probably created more traffic at the peak hours than any other program in that school.

Mr. Lighty agreed with Mr. Newsome, stating that he is appalled that the school district is spending \$20 million on 25 new students.

Mr. Lighty stated there are traffic problems in that area, and the Commission would like DCTS to be a partner in solving them. The Township and applicant are playing with the numbers to see what must be contributed, but Mr. Lighty would like to see the applicant and the Township agree that there is a problem there, and would like the applicant to realize that every child going to that school is going through those intersections, and is very much in danger of being hurt someday. Mr. Lighty would like the school district and the technical school to step up to the plate and help fix the problem. Once schools are established, they do not go anywhere. All around the school there is development

occurring. Mr. Lighty asked for an offer from the school of something that would help not only the entire township, but their own students. He noted that it should really scare the school board and their representatives having that many students bussed through that dangerous of an intersection. Mr. Lighty asked the applicant to partner with the Township in fixing these dangerous conditions. Mr. Bingeman will take that request back to the school board.

Mr. Bingeman noted that the increase may be only 25 students, but the real issue is 977 students that are not housed in an adequate facility, and they are trying to help those 977 students.

Mr. Lighty noted that, in a budget of \$20 million, the cost of making that intersection remarkably safer does not seem significant. Mr. Bingeman could not speak on what could be offered at this time, but would need to take that to the district.

Mr. Lighty stated that from other traffic studies, that is a failing intersection.

Mr. Bingeman asked if the surrounding developments have brought traffic studies to the Township identifying any problems. Mr. Lighty stated that the two immediate projects will make the intersection worse, but those plans have not gotten that far yet, but will also receive the same questioning.

Mr. Straub agreed that the layout of the intersection is not optimal. This plan will add a couple additional trips. Mr. Lighty stated that he understands that the additional trips are what trigger the ordinance requirements of a traffic study, but the larger picture is the safety of the 977 students. That school is a part of the community and should be willing to participate.

Mr. Straub asked what kind of participation the Township is looking for, noting that this plan is spending tax money, whereas the surrounding developments are private, earning profits and can afford those types of things. Mr. Lighty cautioned that the private sector only gets to spend money if it makes money, but the school board simply raises taxes as needed, creating an endless well.

Mr. Straub asked the Commission to quantify what the Township wants. Mr. Lighty stated the problem is Fairmont Drive at Locust Lane, and when the busses leave the school, they go to Locust Lane to get to Fairmont Drive to get to Union Deposit Road, noting that very few go west on Locust Lane. A large majority of the students also use Fairmont Drive from Union Deposit Road from I-83. Mr. Lighty stated that they already know that a large percentage of the students going to and from DCTS, whether bussed or driving, are using a failing intersection that is extremely dangerous. There are accidents there all the time, and it is just a matter of time before a bus is involved.

Mr. Lighty stated that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to say what participation or contribution is appropriate, and left that up to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Lighty asked the applicant to bring an offer to the table, to help solve the problem and protect their own students. The Township is fighting for the Dauphin County Technical School's students.

Mr. Guise agreed, noting that the Planning Commission's power is to recommend, and it is a matter of negotiation between the school board and the Township, noting there should be some responsibility on the part of the school given the number of students.

Mr. Guise questioned the difference on the traffic report between the 542 trips going in, and 325 going out. Mr. Straub stated that he believes it is because most traffic comes in at the same time in the morning, but traffic leaves at various times throughout the day. Mr. Straub noted that the study shows the peak hour only, adding that the daycare would also affect those numbers greatly.

Mr. Guise asked if the report accounts for the loss of the daycare. Mr. Straub stated that the existing count includes the daycare. Mr. Guise asked if students train at the daycare center. Mr. Bingeman stated students do train there, and there are also parents taking their children to the daycare as well. Mr. Guise asked what would happen to the students when the program is discontinued. Mr. Bingeman stated that program would no longer be offered at the school. Mr. Guise asked if that would decrease the number of students. Mr. Bingeman answered yes.

Mr. Guise asked about the waiver for sidewalks along Fairmont Drive. Mr. Bingeman stated they will build sidewalks along Fairmont Drive and have withdrawn that waiver request. Mr. Bingeman noted that the district will also build sidewalks along Locust Lane between the driveway entrances, and therefore withdraw the waiver request for that as well.

Mr. Guise asked about the right-of-way dedication along Fairmont Drive. Mr. Bingeman stated that they will provide that as well, so there is no waiver request for right-of-way dedication.

Mr. Guise asked if the only waiver requests are for the preliminary plan requirement, and the plan sheet size. Mr. Bingeman stated that is correct. Mr. Guise commented that those are positive things.

Mr. Beverly strongly recommended taking into consideration a traffic light, because that intersection handles oncoming traffic as well as the students.

Mr. Guise asked about the comments from HRG concerning landscape buffering. Mr. Bingeman stated they will be installing that. Mr. Bingeman stated that the parking requires three additional trees which will be planted. The area to be buffered is 570 feet, which will require ten 2½ inch caliper shade trees, as well as a planting buffer. Mr. Bingeman estimated about sixty 4-foot shrubs for the planting buffer. Mr. Bingeman stated they are credited for existing on-site vegetation, so the remaining area for the buffer runs along the southern boundary between the soccer field and the proposed Shadebrook development.

Mr. Lighty asked what types of plantings will be used. Mr. Mike Hess, HRG, stated that the ordinance calls for indigenous species to this area, and offered to look at a plan that includes a landscaping plan.

Mr. Lighty suggested coordinating this buffer planting with whatever will be required of Shadebrook. Mr. Hess noted that the buffering is only required of a non-residential use abutting a

residential use. The Institutional use would be required to provide buffering, not the residential use. Mr. Lighty suggested it may still be useful to coordinate the buffer planting, so it does not negatively affect how the TND plan is laid out. Mr. Guise agreed.

Mr. Bingeman had a concern about the timing with regard to coordinating the plans. The DCTS project will be bid in the spring of 2007, in the upcoming months. To be able to incorporate that into the bidding documents, the applicant needs something solid. Mr. Straub noted that money cannot be escrowed for the plantings, because the PDE does not allow for allowances when bidding a project. Mr. Straub suggested putting the buffering into the bid, and if changes are needed, they could be worked out at that time. Mr. Gingrich suggested putting the worst case scenario into the bid, and then it could be reduced or eliminated if it is shown prudent to do so.

Mr. Lighty called for comments from the audience.

Mr. Gene Stoudt, 1638 Whitley Drive in Hunt Club, remarked about the students leaving DCTS in an unsafe manor, they intentionally try to leave the longest black skid marks down the road. The school busses are not the problem, the student drivers are. Mr. Stoudt was more concerned with the intersection of Locust Lane and Nyes Road than Locust at Fairmont Drive. He could not believe there was not a signal there by now, because he saw about two years ago in the Township newsletter that a traffic light was going to be installed at Locust Lane and Nyes Road.

Mr. Lighty explained that the intersection of Fairmont Drive at Locust Lane is “on-site” to this development project. He further explained that the intersection of Locust Lane at Nyes Road is a State road intersection, so the Township is more at the mercy of the State with that intersection than the on-site intersection.

Mr. Stoudt further commented that the school taxes are going to pay for the signal at Fairmont Drive and Locust Lane, and suggested forcing the developers of the hundreds of homes going around the intersection to step up as well. It should be part of the deal that they have to improve these intersections. Mr. Stoudt was concerned about spending taxpayer money for something that the private developers should also. Mr. Lighty agreed, noting they will.

There were no further comments from HRG.

Mr. Guise made a motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #06-40 for Dauphin County Technical School’s Additions and Renovations, subject to addressing the comments, and recommended approval of the waiver of the preliminary plan requirement and plan sheet size requirement, noting that the developer has withdrawn the waiver request for right-of-way dedication on Fairmont Drive and curb and sidewalk installation on Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive. Mr. Guise noted that the Commission appreciates the developer withdrawing those waiver requests. The motion includes a recommendation that as the plan moves forward that the applicant and the Township reach an agreement for participation at an appropriate level in the installation of traffic signals or other appropriate devices at the intersection of Fairmont Drive and Locust Lane. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Rezoning Request
Lawrence W. Conjar

Mr. Lighty announced that the applicant has asked that the rezoning request be tabled to the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Lighty invited the audience to make their comments, and assured them that they would be on the record and remembered by the Commissioners at the time of consideration. Mr. Guise noted that the comments are probably more effective when the applicant is present, but encouraged the audience to make comment at this meeting, the next meeting, or both. The Planning Commission will not be considering the request or making any recommendations on it at this time. Mr. Lighty noted that this request is for rezoning of the land only, it is not a development plan, and is not necessarily directed toward specific development.

A resident asked when the Township knew this plan was going to be tabled. Ms. Moran stated that the Township received notification via fax at 3:30 this afternoon, and the Township does not have the means to contact neighbors in that short of time.

Ms. Linda DeMoranville, a resident of Kings Crossing, asked if the applicant could still develop the land if the rezoning is not granted, and if so, asked to what extent. Mr. Lighty answered that he would still be allowed to develop based on the existing rezoning.

Ms. DeMoranville asked why the rezoning is being requested. Mr. Lighty stated that is a question to ask the applicant.

Mr. Anthony Mosk, president of the Kings Crossing Home Owners Association representing 104 homes, was concerned that Buckingham Road which goes through Kings Crossing, would be extended through what is currently a volleyball court in a Lower Paxton Township park. That road would cause extra traffic going right through a park. There is already a concern over traffic with the 104 existing homes about their own traffic being near kids walking to the park. The safety of the children is the Association's big concern. Another concern Mr. Mosk voiced was the other entrance onto Union Deposit Road, stating he was surprised that that intersection got PennDOT's approval. The nearby intersection of Willoughby Road and Union Deposit Road is already dangerous. Mr. Lighty noted that the road has not gotten PennDOT approval, because the plan has not gotten that far yet. Mr. Mosk stated that he heard that improvements will be made to the park upon the developer's expense, but had not heard to what extent or under whose authority. The Association does not want that roadway to go through their development.

Mr. Harvey Knoll, 6465 Union Deposit Road, at the corner of Willoughby and Union Deposit Roads, built his home there in 1972, and has seen that area of the Township go from a handful of homes to hundreds of homes. This parcel is directly across the street from Mr. Knoll. Mr. Knoll thought the property was 16.8 acres, but now hears it is 19.2 acres including a home with a pond. That could make a difference in the rezoning. Mr. Knoll stated that if the road goes out to Union Deposit Road instead of a cul-de-sac, he can gain five or six more lots in his development.

Mr. Tom Rearson, 6422 Churchill Road, asked the difference between the current zoning and the proposed zoning. Mr. Lighty stated it is currently zoned AR, Agricultural Residential, which allows a minimum lot size of 1.5 acres. Mr. Guise stated the proposed zoning is the Open Space Overlay District, which allows a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet if public sewer and public water are available. In the Open Space Overlay District, the developer must set aside 40% of the land as open space, which is why he submitted a sketch plan.

Mr. Guise asked if the applicant submitted a yield plan. Ms Moran stated a yield plan is not required in the AR District.

Mr. Gary Mills, 6415 Churchill Road, was concerned about the additional traffic because of the proximity to the park and the many children that use the park. Mr. Mills' other concern was the increase in crime within the development. He was worried that it will get even worse with the additional avenue to get out of both developments.

Mr. Ryan Hunter, 6417 Churchill Road, was in attendance in support of the comments raised by his neighbors. Mr. Hunter further commented that the proposed location of the road onto Union Deposit Road is in a bad position on that turn because of a blind spot. There is a significant amount of traffic already using Union Deposit Road, and there have been several accidents and other issues with cars pulling out from the existing road onto Union Deposit Road. Adding another road there will only exacerbate the problem.

Mr. Guise made a motion to table rezoning request for Lawrence Conjar. Mr. Newsome seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan #07-01
Martin L. Schoffstall Children's Trust, et al

No action was taken on this plan.

Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #07-02
TNP Carwash

No action was taken on this plan.

Greenway Committee Update

Ms. Sibert stated that the public meetings have been very well attended, and some people gave some good suggestions at those meetings. The consultant is proceeding to look for places to connect the greenways. The chairman of the Greenway Committee wants to be added to the agenda for the March Planning Commission meeting.

Public Comment

There was no further public comment at this time.

Commissioner Comment

Mr. Guise asked if it is Staff's position, with regard to the Conjar rezoning, that the applicant is not in compliance with the requirements. Ms. Moran answered affirmatively. Mr. Guise asked if that has been communicated to Mr. Conjar, and if he will be redoing his concepts. Mr. Guise noted that it looks like he is way out of compliance. Ms. Moran stated that Jim Cieri of Act One will be taking this to the Supervisor's Workshop Meeting on March 13, 2007, and he has asked that a new hearing be scheduled for the March 14, 2007 Planning Commission meeting. They will refigure the amount of acreage they are off, but they are still going to have to address the sewer issue, which is a substantial issue. The lots are too small as proposed.

Mr. Neff noted that a draft of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) was included in the packets, and asked when that will be discussed. Ms. Moran stated there is a meeting scheduled with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for Tuesday, March 27, 2007 at 5:30 pm.

Mr. Neff asked if the Planning Commission should discuss the SALDO before that meeting. Mr. Lighty asked what the Township is asking the Commission to do with the SALDO. Ms. Moran stated that Staff, including Public Works, Sewer Authority, and Planning and Zoning, has had several meetings with and is working closely with HRG. Mr. Neff commented that it is evident that a lot of work has gone into it already. Mr. Neff noted that he has some comments on it. Ms. Moran suggested that if the Commission has a lot of comments, they could meet prior to that joint meeting. The Commission agreed to meet prior and compile a list of concerns.

Mr. Gingrich asked if the five plans tabled in Old Business are still within their time constraints. Ms. Moran stated they all have issued time extensions on their plans. Ms. Moran noted that Stray Winds Farm will be ready for consideration at the March meeting. The Shuler plan and St Thomas Roasters will not be considered for some time, but they do have time extensions. The Township did receive a plan for the Conjar subdivision so that will be considered at the March meeting as well as the Conjar rezoning. The Schoffstall plan will be waiting on the new Steep Slope Ordinance. Mr. Newsome asked if the Commissioners should keep the plans they received or if they will be sent new revised ones. Ms. Moran stated they should keep at least the car wash plan and material, since they will be at the March meeting.

Mr. Lighty stated the Wilshire plan was supposed to connect its second access through the Schoffstall tract, but the Schoffstall plan does not show an exit from Wilshire. Mr. Lighty was disappointed that that did not get followed through on, noting that he understood that they could not force Schoffstall to do it.

Mr. Neff noted that for some time he was confused that islands were not allowed in cul-de-sacs in the old SALDO, and asked if the new SALDO corrects that, requiring an island. Mr. Hess stated that the old and new SALDO both prohibit islands within a cul-de-sac. Mr. Neff stated that a 90-foot cul-de-sac is ugly. But an island in it would make it nicer, and the neighbors tend to keep it looking very nice and use it to interface with each other. Ms. Moran added that boulevard entrances are a similar issue. Developers hesitate to install them because neighbors do not want the responsibility of maintaining them.

Adjournment

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for March 14, 2007 at 7:00pm at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, Room 171. The Planning Commission will conduct a workshop meeting to discuss the draft Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance at 5:30pm in Room 174 of the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, with a light meal at 5:00 pm.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:11pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary